

**Minutes**  
**Superintendent's Advisory Committee**  
**Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) of 1999**

**General Services Building**  
**1325 J Street, Room 1519**  
**Sacramento, CA 95814**

**July 19, 2000**  
**1:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Holly Covin, Co-chair; Assistant Executive Director, Policy Analysis & Research, CSBA  
Vicki Barber, El Dorado County Superintendent of Schools  
Tom Boysen, Senior Vice President, Education, Milken Family Foundation  
Mary Alice Callahan, President, Morgan Hill Federation of Teachers  
Bob Friedman, Chief Operations Officer, CSIS  
Kelvin Lee, Superintendent, Dry Creek Joint Elementary School  
Lynette Nyaggah, Teacher, Rio Hondo College  
Dolores Ochoa, Parent, State Parent Advisory Board  
Jeff Orlinsky, Teacher, Warren High School  
Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, ESL Consultant, Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Irene Sumida, Co-Director, Fenton Avenue Charter School  
Rosie Thompson, Business Unit Executive, IBM Global Education  
Charles Weis, Ventura County Superintendent of Schools  
Lynn Wilen, Superintendent, Reef Sunset Unified School District

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Sam Araki, Former President, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Space  
Eva Baker, Director, Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California at Los Angeles  
Sue Burr, Undersecretary, Office of the Secretary for Education  
Rudy Castruita, San Diego County Superintendent of Schools  
Carl Cohn, Superintendent, Long Beach Unified School District  
General Davie, Jr., Superintendent, San Juan Unified School District  
Leslie DeMersseman, Immediate Past President, California School Boards Association  
Patsy Estrellas, Teacher, Norwalk La Mirada School District/California Teachers Association  
Ed Haertel, Professor, Stanford University, School of Education  
Jerry Hayward, Director, Policy Analysis for California Education  
Javier Gonzales, Teacher, Pioneer High School  
Janett Humphries, President, SEIU Local 99, Los Angeles Unified School District  
Jere Jacobs, Former Assistant Vice President, Pacific Telesis  
Cecelia Mansfield, California State PTA  
Sidney Morrison, Principal, Arnold Elementary School/ACSA State President  
Bill Ouchi, Vice-Dean, Anderson School, University of California at Los Angeles  
Pat Pineda, Co-Chair; Vice President, Legal, Environmental, and Government Affairs, NUMMI

Scott Plotkin, Chief Consultant and Staff Director, Senate Education Committee  
Tamara Powers, Parent  
Ernesto Ruiz, Director, Migrant Education, Region 2, Butte County Office of Education  
Rene Townsend, Professor/Consultant, CSU San Marcos, College of Education

#### STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION LIAISONS

Marian Bergeson (Present)  
Susan Hammer (Absent)

#### PRINCIPAL STAFF TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Paul Warren, Deputy Superintendent, Accountability Branch  
William Padia, Director, Office of Policy and Evaluation Division  
Wendy Harris, Director, Education Support and Networks Division  
Pat McCabe, Manager, Education Planning and Information Center  
Linda Carstens, Manager, Awards and Evaluation Unit

Call to Order: Ms. Covin called the meeting to order at 1:12 p.m.

Introductions: Ms. Covin invited the members, staff, and audience to introduce themselves.

Organizational Matters: Ms. Covin scheduled future meeting dates for the full PSAA Advisory Committee. Subcommittees meet in the mornings then reconvene as a full Advisory Committee in the afternoons on the following dates:

September 28, 2000  
November 14, 2000  
January 17, 2001  
March 21, 2001  
May 16, 2001  
July 18, 2001

#### July State School Board Actions:

Ms. Covin stated that the Awards Subcommittee recommendations to the State Board of Education were well received. The State Board accepted all the recommendations except the suggested participation rate for high school students. A considerable discussion ensued with the Board recommending changing the high school participation rate from 95% to 90%. Implementing this change, approximately 20% more high schools would be eligible for awards this year. The State Board agreed to begin with a 90% participation rate and build to 95% over time.

Jerry Hayward presented the three awards programs to the State Board by reviewing the award matrix. He introduced the Governor's Performance Award (GPA) Program, which is a component of SB 1X. He stated that it is the Governor's intent to fully fund all schools that meet their growth and comparable growth targets at \$150 per student. He explained that a school with a high amount of parent waivers would not exclude a school from becoming eligible for awards, but the waivers would not be included in the funding formula. He went on to describe how the funding formula is calculated.

Regarding the School Site Employee Performance (SEP) Bonus Program, Mr. Hayward stated there is \$350 million in one time funding available. He stressed that the funds would be split between all FTE staff at the school and the school site for one-time use. He stated the program requires the same eligibility criteria as the GPA program.

The last award program Mr. Hayward presented was the Certificated Staff Performance Incentive Act (AB 1114). He reminded State Board members that only schools in the bottom half of the distribution (deciles 1-5) would be eligible for the award. Eligibility criteria included the 95% participation rate for elementary and middle schools and 90% for high schools. The 2000 API must demonstrate a 10% growth rate and subgroups must demonstrate 80% of the 10%. In addition, the schools must demonstrate growth on Stanford-9 between 1998 and 1999. The recommended distribution is as follows:

1,000 certificated staff would receive \$25,000.

3,500 certificated staff would receive \$10,000.

7,500 certificated staff would receive \$5,000.

Kindergarten, 1<sup>st</sup> grade and 12<sup>th</sup> grade teachers will be included in the award program.

The Alternative Accountability subcommittee co-chair, Lynn Wilen, reviewed the "Summary of Issues and Recommendations for the Development and Implementations of an Alternative Accountability System." She stated that the State Board approved all the issues including the timeline.

Ms. Wilen stated that the State Board was particularly interested in Issue # 6, "Providing a system of recognition and intervention for schools in the Alternative Accountability System." She said the Board expressed hope that support for these schools could be forthcoming in legislation. She stated the Board gave the committee accolades for being so thorough and thus it was not necessary for a lot of discussion before making the decisions. She thanked State Board member Marian Bergeson, for being present and supportive of the committee.

Ms. Bergeson stated that the State Board of Education was able to be so supportive because the two reports were highly technical yet very understandable. She added that the API was going to be the bottom line as the Board worked on the addition of the High School Exit Examination, and other factors to the API in the future. She stated that the State Board decided to use the Stanford-9 results for the 2000 API. Ms. Bergeson ended by stating "You have done a super job. We have seen a lot of reports. You made the issues and recommendations clear thus making it easy for the State Board able to understand the issues and make decisions. We appreciate your efforts."

#### Awards Subcommittee Report-Out:

Ms. Covin reported on four areas of concern. The first area focused on the issue of testing irregularities. The group discussed what to do when districts self-report that cheating occurred, when Harcourt-Brace reports a high number of answer changes in their erasure analysis.

Ms. Covin identified two types of irregularities, student cheating and institutional problems (adults involved by helping students cheat or adults changed student responses). She stated the Technical Design Group, TDG, suggested that when it was found that kids were cheating, their test scores

should not be included in the API. For institutional cheating, the TDG believed the school site not be included in the award. Discussion ensued around the question, “How do we treat the school site, if the district does everything right, but still a teacher cheats?” Additional questions included:

What is the frequency of cheating?

What constitutes cheating?

Ms. Covin stated the second type of cheating centered on the concept of demographic data irregularities, and/or completing district header sheets incorrectly. Questions included:

Should incorrectly completing the header sheets background factors, be considered cheating?

How do we decide what is an error and what is an intended adjustment?

Is there a way to test for mistakes on the header sheets?

Could we do an erasure check on the header sheets?

The second issue discussed was about legitimate test preparation. Questions included:

What is appropriate proctoring?

What are the district roles? Who conducts follow up checks on the allegations?

What are the consequences for staff? (a district decision including the firing of staff)

How did districts deal with finding out who did the cheating?

Are the student scores of the adults identified as cheating, eliminated from the enrollment number, or the test taker number? (Right now the scores are not included on the school or district total)

How to recapture the award if cheating has been discovered after the reward release?

If there is a district cover up, should there be an exclusion of the award?

Who should review the evidence and make a judgment?

Who should make the decision to withdraw the award?

After lengthy discussion, the Awards subcommittee suggested that an external panel be developed to review these cases and provide a commendation to the State Superintendent or State Board. The members agreed if the district is diligent in monitoring/reporting irregularities, then the scores of only the offending individuals should be excluded.

A recommendation was made to communicate with the field that there will be an effective and consistent process addressing testing irregularities put into place. Members stressed the importance of maintaining consistency during the whole process.

The committee discussed and agreed the tests of students cheating should be eliminated. They also agreed that awards should be held up for distribution when a school was charged with cheating.

The members agreed that the role of the review panel would be to only recommend that due diligence did or did not occur. The burden of proof should be placed on the District/ School to show that they did everything to prevent cheating. The committee stressed the importance of the department communicating to the field that districts apply the highest diligence in regards to testing administration.

The third issue focused on school reconfiguration problems when calculating the 2000 API growth targets. Discussion centered on what should occur when school boundaries change, school populations change or school grade spans change. After lengthy discussion on the types of ways a school could reconfigure, it was agreed that there are two primary areas to analyze: grade span revisions and student population changes. Staff reported that they would share these concerns at the Technical Design group meeting on July 20<sup>th</sup>.

The last issue discussed was the development of a timeline. Department of Education staff stressed the importance of creating a clear and thoughtful timeline for the release of API information and sequencing of award dissemination. Staff reported they anticipated receiving test data tapes from the Assessment Office in early August.

Discussion continued regarding the pros and cons of conducting a one, two or three phase release of information in the fall. The group decided that the following three stage release would be the most appropriate:

Stage #1 would occur at the end of September and include:

- API growth data for 2000
- Growth targets achieved/not achieved
- Similar Schools Ranks based on growth
- Eligibility for the second cohort of II/USP
- Significant subgroup data
- GPA and School Site award eligibility

Stage #2 would occur in late October and include:

- AB 1114 school eligibility and application process

Stage #3 would occur December-January and include:

- 2000 API baseline
- 2001 School growth target
- 2001 Significant Subgroup growth targets
- 2000 similar schools ranks for API baseline

By conducting the three stage release, the focus on achieving growth targets is maintained, the data are disseminated in understandable segments, it provides opportunity to correct data errors, and maintains the II/USP legislative timelines identified in SB 1552.

#### Alternative Accountability Report-out:

Ms. Barber focused first on the question, “What types of recognition would small schools be eligible?” The group recommended the Awards Subcommittee look at an award system that would recognize the small schools, and alternative education schools and centers for monetary and non-monetary awards.

Ms. Barber reported that there was considerable discussion and concern about assigning test results back to the school which students came from if the student transferred from a regular education

school to an alternative education setting within a 90 day period before testing. The subcommittee recommended sending the tests scores back to the student's school of origin, and have the scores count in the prior school's API calculations. They believe it would deter schools from "dumping students" into the alternative system prior to the testing period. Staff reported that operationally the idea is very difficult to implement. Mr. Padia stated he would ask staff to do a review of other states and research CSIS to get other possible indicators for alternative methods. He suggested that at the next meeting, the subcommittee develop a list of indicators, then discuss how to determine growth targets.

The third discussion point centered on the length of time schools would be required to participate in the Alternative Accountability program. The subcommittee recommended that once a school opted into an Alternative Accountability program, the decision would last three years.

Public Comment: There was none.

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Awards Subcommittee will be Thursday, August 17, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The next full meeting of the PSAA will occur September 28, 2000 from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., General Services Building, 1325 J Street, Room, 1519, Sacramento, California.

Adjournment: Ms. Covin adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Seabourne,  
Recording Secretary